



MINUTES Enterprise Architecture Committee

DATE	October 20, 2005
TIME	2:00 PM
LOCATION	Department of Information Technology – Conference Room 505 E. King Street Carson City, NV 89701
RECORDER	Roger Sliva, Enterprise Architect

ATTENDEES

Name	Attend	Name	Attend
Chair – Dave McTeer Dept. of Administration	✓	Co-Chair – Terry Savage Dept. of Information Technology	✓
Chuck Moltz Office of the Attorney General	✓	Chuck Conner Dept. of Motor Vehicles	
Dan O'Barr Dept. of Corrections	✓	Doug Wells Dept. of Public Safety	✓
Dave Stewart Dept. of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation		Tom Wolf Nevada Dept. of Transportation	
Andrew Tucker Gaming Control Board	✓	Gary Buonacorsi Welfare Division	
Ernie Hernandez Health Division		Roger Sliva Dept. of Information Technology	✓
Roberta Roth Nevada System of Higher Education		Brian Guest Dept. of Information Technology	
Kathy Ryan Dept. of Information Technology	✓	Alisanne Maffei Dept. of Information Technology	✓

I Call to Order

Dave McTeer called the meeting to order. Previous meeting minutes were approved.

II Discussion - Enterprise Identity Management (IdM)

Dave McTeer began the discussion with a review of the briefings given to the IT Strategic Planning Committee (ITSPC) that morning on identity management (IdM). Dave emphasized that a distributed model for IdM would be most acceptable. Terry Savage suggested that both a distributed and centralized model be addressed for enterprise TIRs for IdM. Doug Wells brought up security and privacy concerns for centralized IdM models. Terry suggested developing pros and cons, cost comparisons, and then let the ITSPC decide.

The group discussed cost pools to enable multi-agency projects. Several members noted authority difficulties in sharing resources when interfacing with and/or being funded by the federal government.

Dave noted that a fiscal impact analysis would be needed for any enterprise IdM project.

Roger Sliva distributed and discussed a draft IdM plan outline. The committee reviewed and discussed the principles and goals set forth in the outline. Doug noted that IdM goals need to be phrased so as not to be an immediate drawback to going forward. Adjustments were recommended for the principles for the same reason.

Doug asked for clarification on IdM benefits in the plan as well as usage scenarios.

Further discussion concluded that local governments and boards need not be considered when planning for an IdM system. Also discussed was the need for IdM standards and specifications.

III Wrap-Up

Further review of potential IdM plans and deliverables will continue at the next meeting scheduled for January 2006.